929449



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE Patent and Tradamark Offica

Addrass: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington, O.C. 20231

FIRST NAMED INVENTOR ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. SERIAL NUMBER FILING DATE 801-108 FINK 08/14/92 07/929,449 EXAMINER 33M1/0713 PAPER NUMBER FRANK H. FOSTER ART UNIT 7632 SLATE RIDGE BLVD. COLUMBUS, OH 43068 3308 DATE MAILED: 07713793 This is a communication from the examiner in charge of your application. COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS This epplication has been exemined 30 days from the date of this letter. A shortened statutory period for rasponsa to this action is sat to axpire_ month(e), Failura to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned. 35 U.S.C. 133 THE FOLLOWING ATTACHMENT(S) ARE PART OF THIS ACTION: 2. Notice re Patent Drawing, PTO-948. 1. Notice of Raferences Citad by Examinar, PTO-892. 3. Notice of Art Citad by Applicant, PTO-1449. 4. Notice of informel Patent Application, Form PTO-152: 6. 5. Information on How to Effact Drawing Changas, PTO-1474. Part II SUMMARY OF ACTION 1. X Ciaims _____ ara withdrawn from consideration. Of tha abova, claims 2. Claims ... 3. Claims _ 4. Cleims 5. Cialms_ ara subject to rastriction or alaction raquirament. 6. A Claims ... 7. This application has been filed with informal drewings under 37 C.F.R. 1.85 which are acceptable for examination purposes. 6. Formal drawings are required in response to this Office action. __. Undar 37 C.F.R. 1.84 thase drawings 9.

The corrected or substitute drawings have been received on ____ ara 🔲 accaptabia. 🗋 not accaptabia (see axpisnation or Notica re Patant Drawing, PTO-948). ____ has (heva) been 🔲 approvad by tha 10. The proposed additional or substitute sheat(s) of drawings, filed on ____ axaminar. disepproved by the axaminer (see axplanation). 11. The proposed drawing correction, fliad on _______, has been approvad. disapprovad (see axplenation). 12.

Acknowledgment is made of the claim for priority under U.S.C. 119. The certified copy has

been received

not been received _____; filad on . baan filed in parant application, serial no. 13.

Since this application appears to be in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 D.G. 213. 14. Othar

EXAMINER'S ACTION

Serial Number: 07/929,449 -2-

Art Unit: 3308

This application contains claims directed to the following patentably distinct species of the claimed invention:

- I. the fluid material comprises ceramic particles which are sintered
- II. the fluid material comprises ceramic particles chich are cemented together with a second ceramic material
- III. the fluid material comprises ceramic particles which are cemented together with a polymer
- IV. the fluid material comprises ceramic particles suspended in a liquid monomer which is polymerized.
- V. the fluid material is a photo-active polymeric material.

Applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. § 121 to elect a single disclosed species for prosecution on the merits to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. Currently, claims 1-5 and 11-13 are generic.

Applicant is advised that a response to this requirement must include an identification of the species that is elected consonant with this requirement, and a listing of all claims readable thereon, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered nonresponsive unless accompanied by an election.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which are written in dependent form or otherwise include all the limitations of an allowed generic claim as provided by 37 C.F.R. § 1.141. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species. M.P.E.P. § 809.02(a).

Serial Number: 07/929,449 -3-

Art Unit: 3308

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103 of the other invention.

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Randy Shay at telephone number (703) 308-2907 on Mondays and Thursdays.

Randy C. Shay

Primary Examiner
Art Unit 330

R. Shay

July 13, 1993